

**A. CALL MEETING TO ORDER**

A Virtual Meeting of the City of Redondo Beach Planning Commission was called to order by Chair Elder at 7:00 p.m.

**B. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present: Hinsley, Toporow, Strutzenberg, Ung, Vice Chair Glad, Chair Elder

Commissioners Absent: Rodriguez

Officials Present: Brandy Forbes, Community Development Director  
Sean Scully, Planning Manager  
Antonio Gardea, Senior Planner  
Lina Portolese, Planning Analyst  
Eleanor Manzano, City Clerk

**C. SALUTE TO THE FLAG**

Vice Chair Glad led in the Salute to the Flag.

Chair Elder called for a moment of silence in honor of those suffering from COVID-19 and the current wildfires.

**D. APPROVAL OF ORDER OF AGENDA**

Motion by Commissioner Strutzenberg, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to approve the Order of Agenda as presented. Motion carried unanimously (6-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

**E. BLUE FOLDER ITEMS – ADDITIONAL BACK UP MATERIALS**

**E.1 Receive and File Written Communications and Blue Folder Items**

Motion by Commissioner Strutzenberg, seconded by Commissioner Ung, to receive and file Written Communications and Blue Folder Items. Motion carried unanimously (6-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

**F. CONSENT CALENDAR**

**F.1 Approve Affidavit of Posting of Planning Commission Regular Meeting of September 17, 2020**

**F.2 Approve Minutes of the Regular Planning Commission meeting of August 20, 2020**

**F.3 Receive and File Planning Commission Referrals to Staff Update**

Planning Analyst Lina Portolese announced there were no e-Comments or written communications received regarding the Consent Calendar.

Commissioner Hinsley pulled Item No. F.2 from the Consent Calendar for separate consideration.

Motion by Commissioner Toporow, seconded by Commissioner Strutzenberg, to approve Items No. F.1 and F.3 under the Consent Calendar. Motion carried unanimously (6-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

**G. EXCLUDED CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS**

**G.1 (F.2) Approve Minutes of the Regular Planning Commission meeting of August 20, 2020**

Commissioner Hinsley referenced a Blue Folder Item with suggested edits to the meeting minutes of August 20, 2020.

Commissioner Strutzenberg offered edits to Page 7, Paragraph 2 of the minutes, as follows: "Commissioner Strutzenberg voiced caution in declaring a need for new and improved office space, in a post-pandemic work environment; this may or may not be true, especially because more people are working from home; expressed concerns regarding incentivizing desired businesses and asked about traffic flows on Artesia Boulevard."

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Ung, to approve Item No. F.2, under the Consent Calendar, as corrected. Motion carried (5-1), by roll call vote, with Vice Chair Glad, abstaining and Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

**H. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

**H.1 Receive and File Written Communications for the Planning Commission on Non-Agenda Items**

Planning Analyst Lina Portolese announced there were no e-Comments received regarding non-agenda items.

Motion by Commissioner Toporow, seconded by Vice Chair Glad to receive and file Written Communications for the Planning Commission on Non-Agenda Items. Motion carried unanimously (6-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

## **I. EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS**

Commissioner Hinsley reported speaking with Commissioner Strutzenberg regarding Item No. J.1, with staff regarding Item No. J.2 and the public, Councilmember Gran, City staff and attended a community meeting hosted by Councilmember Horvath regarding Item No. J.3.

Commissioner Strutzenberg reported speaking with Commissioner Hinsley regarding Item No. J.1.

Chair Elder reported speaking with a resident regarding Item No. J.2 and regarding Item No. J.3, attended a GPAC meeting and a public forum and discussed it with Councilmembers Emdee, Gran and Horvath as well as residents at a community meeting hosted by Councilmember Horvath.

## **J. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**J.1.** A PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER AN EXEMPTION DECLARATION AND VARIANCE FOR A REDUCED REAR SETBACK TO CONSTRUCT AN ADDITION TO AN EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE CONNECTING TO THE DETACHED GARAGE ON PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN A LOW-DENSITY, SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (R-1) ZONE.

PROPERTY OWNER: Ian and Victoria Phillips  
APPLICANT: Same as Owner  
PROPERTY ADDRESS: 2736 Spreckels Lane  
CASE NO: VAR-2020-02

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

1. Open the public hearing, administer oath, take testimony, and deliberate;
2. Close the public hearing;
3. Adopt a resolution by title only approving the Exemption Declaration and Variance subject to the findings and conditions contained therein.

**CONTACT: ANTONIO GARDEA, SENIOR PLANNER**

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Toporow to open the Public Hearing. Motion carried unanimously (6-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

Chair Elder administered the Audience Oath to members of the public wishing to address the Planning Commission on this item.

Senior Planner Antonio Gardea presented the report addressing the property location, existing conditions, zoning, setbacks, existing and proposed floor plan, applicable development standards, existing and proposed site plan, similar surrounding properties, the need for a variance and recommendations.

Commissioner Hinsley asked about the lot sizes of the surrounding properties that were granted variances in the past.

In reply to Chair Elder's question regarding whether the variance would apply if the property owners decided to build a second story in the future, Senior Planner Gardea noted the variance is specific to this project and if the property owner decided to build a second story, the project would need to be reviewed by the Planning Commission as they would be adding to a non-conforming setback. He reported that because the property owner is adding over 50% of the existing square footage, they would be required to comply with current building codes.

Chair Elder invited the applicant/property owner to address the Commission.

Applicant and Property Owner Ian Phillips indicated the property has become too small for a growing family; noted they would like to add another bedroom and bathroom; reported surrounding residents have made similar expansions and asked that the Planning Commission grant their request for a variance.

In response to Chair Elder's question regarding plans to add solar, Mr. Phillips stated they have not decided yet.

In reply to Commissioner Strutzenberg's question, Mr. Phillips addressed replacement of the roof and roofing materials. Commissioner Strutzenberg felt it presents a good opportunity to add solar.

Chair Elder discussed the benefits of rewiring the garage for electric vehicles.

Senior Planner Gardea reported surrounding properties are basically the same as the subject property in terms of being 105' in length.

Chair Elder spoke in favor of the project.

Commissioner Strutzenberg commented positively on the design and the renderings in the presentation.

Discussion followed regarding variances granted in the past.

Planning Manager Sean Scully reported that the City's variance laws are based on the State's variance laws and they have not changed since the 60's.

Vice Chair Glad spoke positively about the project; noted the proposal keeps the property consistent with the neighborhood and reported the addition is modest.

Commissioner Strutzenberg expressed concerns regarding setting a bad precedence.

Community Development Director Brandy Forbes stated there are specific requirements that must be met to grant a variance and any application coming forward would have to meet those criteria, which the subject project does.

Vice Chair Glad wondered if there is language that could be added to prevent this project being used as precedence for the proliferation of “McMansions” in the future.

Discussion followed regarding a preference for smaller additions that are consistent with surrounding neighborhoods and including additional findings to prevent setting precedence in justifying larger projects.

Commissioner Hinsley stated he would be interested in modifying the findings as the criteria for special circumstances do not seem sufficient. Senior Planner Gardea reported the position of the garage is a legal, non-conforming structure and if it were to be built to code, the garage would be in the top left corner of the lot and they would lose back yard space. Commissioner Hinsley suggested adding language to the findings that “this lot’s length, with R-1 requirements, makes the buildable space, untenable”.

Commissioner Ung stated it would seem any property in that neighborhood is subject to the same setbacks and questioned if that is a special circumstance.

Commissioner Hinsley opined that having an existing two-car garage is not a special circumstance to the property.

Commissioner Strutzenberg expressed concerns regarding using projects from the 60’s and 80’s as precedence to justify the project.

Community Development Director Forbes reported the agenda report is part of the record.

Commissioner Ung stated he does not view the projects from the 60’s and 80’s as precedence but views them as examples that are not out of character with the neighborhood.

Commissioner Hinsley felt the findings and special circumstances should not reference other properties.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Strutzenberg to receive and file staff’s PowerPoint presentation. Motion carried unanimously (6-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

Motion by Commissioner Toporow, seconded by Vice Chair Glad to close the Public Hearing. Motion carried unanimously (6-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

Motion by Commissioner Hinsley to adopt a resolution by title only approving the Exemption Declaration and Variance subject to the findings and conditions contained therein, with the following modification: Modify Finding No. 1 to strike “Surrounding properties abutting to the south...” and add language “The property’s lot size and front and rear setback requirements

limit the development as a special circumstance applicable to the property”.

Commissioner Strutzenberg offered a friendly amendment to remove references to other properties under Finding No. 1.B.

Amended motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to adopt a resolution by title only approving the Exemption Declaration and Variance subject to the findings and conditions contained therein, with the following modifications: Modify Finding No. 1.A to strike “Surrounding properties abutting to the south...” and add language “The property’s lot size and front and rear setback requirements limit the development as a special circumstance applicable to the property” and removing references to other properties under Finding No. 1.B.

Planning Manager Scully noted the criteria identify the findings and surrounding properties as special circumstances.

Regarding setting precedence, Community Development Director Forbes suggested the following language: “A precedent would not be set with this approval for neighboring projects seeking a variance of greater size or height.”

Commissioner Ung felt that the properties demonstrate that they exist, and the City would not be granting something out of the ordinary. When they were granted or built is not as important as the surrounding neighborhood.

Community Development Director Forbes added that no precedence is established in the findings or resolution but rather the properties are listed as acknowledging they surround the subject property.

Planning Manager Scully reiterated that the criteria allow the surroundings as special circumstances and precedence is limited in that the project must be consistent with its surroundings.

Vice Chair Glad did not believe setting a precedent is as big of a concern given the scope and size of the project, the nature of the project, the fact that it is consistent with the surrounding neighborhood and the existing language in the code. Having more projects this size, may help in demonstrating that “McMansions” are inconsistent with the character of a neighborhood.

Substitute motion by Commissioner Ung, to adopt a resolution by title only approving the Exemption Declaration and Variance subject to the findings and conditions contained therein.

Commissioner Ung withdrew the substitute motion.

Commissioner Hinsley restated his amended motion.

Amended motion by Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Vice Chair Glad to adopt a

resolution by title only approving the Exemption Declaration and Variance subject to the findings and conditions contained therein, with the following modifications: Modify Finding No. 1.A changing the first sentence of the italicized explanation to read, "The property is developed with an existing, detached, two-car garage on a corner lot, with a side-facing garage", striking the last sentence, "Surrounding properties abutting to the south..." and striking the last sentence on Finding No. 1.B. Motion carried unanimously (6-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

Commissioner Strutzenberg and Chair Elder commended the property owners on the project.

**J.2. PUBLIC HEARING TO CONSIDER ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS  
RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL AMEND TITLE 10, CHAPTER 5 OF  
THE MUNICIPAL CODE PERTAINING TO ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS IN  
RESIDENTIAL ZONES IN THE COASTAL ZONE, CONSISTENT WITH STATE LAW  
AND AMENDING TITLE 10, CHAPTER 2 OF THE MUNICIPAL CODE PERTAINING  
TO ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES CONSISTENT WITH  
STATE LAW AND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT A FINDING THAT THE  
AMENDMENTS ARE STATUTORILY EXEMPT FROM THE CALIFORNIA  
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA)**

**PROCEDURES:**

- a) Open Public Hearing, administer oath to the public, take testimony, and deliberate;
- b) Close Public Hearing; and
- c) Adopt a resolution by title only recommending that the City Council amend Title 10 Chapter 5 of the Municipal Code pertaining to accessory dwelling units in residential zones in the Coastal Zone consistent with State law with a finding that the amendments are statutorily exempt from CEQA; and
- d) Adopt a resolution by title only recommending that the City Council amend Title 10 Chapter 2 of the Municipal Code pertaining to Accessory Dwelling Units in residential zones consistent with State law with a finding that the amendments are statutorily exempt from CEQA.

**CONTACT: BRANDY FORBES, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR**

Motion by Commissioner Toporow, seconded by Commissioner Strutzenberg to open the Public Hearing. Motion carried unanimously (6-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

Chair Elder administered the Audience Oath to members of the public wishing to address the Planning Commission on this item.

Community Development Director Forbes presented the report addressing background on State legislation, basic key changes to the legislation, categories of streamlined ADUs, differences between coastal zoning and inland zoning resolutions, details of the streamlined ADU categories including associated limits, conditions for all streamlined including parking and Coastal Development Permit, non-streamlined ADUs, procedures and recommendations.



Chair Elder commended staff on the work and for doing what it can so that the City maintains local control. He invited members of the public to address the Commission.

Holly Osbourn referenced the pandemic and noted having ADUs at 5' apart is not considered socially distanced and spoke about SB 1120, units allowed and adding ADUs if a city has a granny flat ordinance.

Terry Gasparovic discussed the ability for R-2 units to build two-story ADUs; spoke about not wanting a condominium built behind his house, but something much smaller; reported that building a two-story ADU allows them to maintain open space and agreed with a push towards smaller developments.

Planning Analyst Portolese read an e-Comment from Bruce Bernard with questions regarding allowing multi-story ADUs on single-family lots and addressing multi-story streamlined ADUs in the ordinance, the administrative report, and the resolution.

Community Development Director Forbes reported if a project meets the basic requirements for a streamlined ADU, the City cannot require anything beyond that. However, the City can restrict the height (16') for a detached structure. The number of stories is not mentioned and therefore, the City is not allowed to impose additional restrictions. Additionally, she noted that ADUs cannot count towards a property's density.

Commissioner Strutzenberg asked about other states with similar regulations and Community Development Director Forbes stated she has not observed where other states are mandating ADUs; noted many municipalities have pushed back and reported the City has sent letters of opposition, but she is not aware of any litigation challenging the State. She discussed sunset of owner-occupancy; reported anything that was granted a permit prior to January 1, 2020 with owner-occupancy restrictions will be allowed to continue; confirmed there will be a mix throughout the City and indicated a deed restriction would need to be recorded. Community Development Director Forbes added there is no rush in applications; reported there have been more inquiries than applications and noted applications that have been submitted are complying with State regulations as well as what the City has drafted. She stated that the City has opted not to allow converting ADUs to separate units or subdivisions; addressed the 16' height requirement and precluding building second stories over garages and reported the City can only limit the number of stories in non-streamlined ADUs. In terms of parking, Community Development Director Forbes reported applicants can use any configuration and could park on setbacks and discussed proximity to public transit.

Commissioner Toporow asked about a requirement for open space and Community Development Director Forbes reiterated that if a streamline ADU meets the State's basic standards, the City must approve the application and may not impose any other standards.

Discussion followed regarding the possibility of challenging the legislation, the need to provide justification for parking under the coastal zone, maintaining access to the waterfront and recent parking/use surveys.



In reply to Commissioner Hinsley's question about an appeals process, Community Development Director Forbes stated she has not seen any regulations relative to an appeals process.

Commissioner Strutzenberg asked about pending legislation that would affect ADUs and Community Development Director Forbes reported the matter is stabilized for now and there have been no changes to the regulations.

Motion by Vice Chair Glad, seconded by Commissioner Toporow, to close the Public Hearing. Motion carried unanimously (6-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

Motion by Commissioner Strutzenberg, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to receive and file the PowerPoint presentation. Motion carried unanimously (6-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

Motion by Commissioner Ung, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to adopt a resolution by title only recommending that the City Council amend Title 10 Chapter 5 of the Municipal Code pertaining to accessory dwelling units in residential zones in the Coastal Zone consistent with State law with a finding that the amendments are statutorily exempt from CEQA. Motion carried (5-1), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Toporow, opposed and Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

Motion by Commissioner Ung, seconded by Vice Chair Glad, to adopt a resolution by title only recommending that the City Council amend Title 10 Chapter 2 of the Municipal Code pertaining to Accessory Dwelling Units in residential zones consistent with State law with a finding that the amendments are statutorily exempt from CEQA. Motion carried unanimously (6-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

**J.3. PUBLIC HEARING TO DISCUSS, RECEIVE PUBLIC INPUT/COMMENTS, CONSIDER, AND MAKE A RECOMMENDATION TO THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL ON THE DRAFT ARTESIA & AVIATION CORRIDORS AREA PLAN (AACAP) WHICH INCLUDES STRATEGIES TO ACTIVATE, ENERGIZE, AND REVITALIZE THE ARTESIA AND AVIATION CORRIDORS. THE DRAFT ARTESIA & AVIATION CORRIDORS AREA PLAN DOCUMENT CAPTURES THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF PREVIOUS EFFORTS AS WELL AS THE ANALYSIS, DISCUSSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GPAC). THE DRAFT AACAP DEFINES A NUMBER OF STRATEGIES AND IMPLEMENTABLE ACTIONS THAT WILL GUIDE THE REVITALIZATION OF THE ARTESIA AND AVIATION CORRIDORS, INCLUDING PHYSICAL PLACEMAKING ENHANCEMENTS SUCH AS OUTDOOR DINING, PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS (BENCHES, LANDSCAPING, LIGHTING, AND CROSSWALK IMPROVEMENTS), CONNECTIVITY TO SURROUNDING NEIGHBORHOODS, AND NEW GATHERING SPACES TO CREATE A SENSE OF "PLACE AND CHARACTER".**

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Open the public hearing, accept any public comments/input, review, discuss, and consider the comments from each Planning Commissioner and reach consensus on any recommended comments, changes, and edits to the Draft Artesia & Aviation Corridors Area Plan (January 2020);
2. Close the public hearing;
3. Adopt the attached Resolution and "Exhibit A" recommending that the City Council consider the Draft AACAP with any proposed comments, changes, or edits to be noted in "Exhibit A".

CONTACT: SEAN SCULLY, PLANNING MANAGER

Vice Chair Glad recused herself from this item and the remainder of the meeting; announced that her family is moving out of the State and reported she tendered her resignation from the Planning Commission and GPAC, which was approved by City Council. She expressed her appreciation to Commission colleagues for their thoughtful consideration of issues and the hard work and dedication of staff.

Members of the Commission thanked Ms. Glad for her service and wished her well.

Ms. Glad left the meeting at 9:57 p.m.

Motion by Commissioner Toporow, seconded by Commissioner Strutzenberg to reopen the Public Hearing. Motion carried unanimously (5-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

Planning Manager Sean Scully reviewed the deliberation process and PowerPoint slides noting staff has included most of the Planning Commission's previous comments into the presentation.

Chair Elder discussed his comments and suggestions for the AACAP in terms of actionable items including restoring the name of Redondo Beach Boulevard.

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 3-2 (Ung and Strutzenberg) vote to recommend that City Council consider restoring the name of Redondo Beach Boulevard and was agreed to.*

Regarding PM.6, Chair Elder suggested the City Council consider adjusting the FAR greater than 0.6 as anything less will not provide sufficient incentives for redevelopment for specific uses. Commissioner Toporow agreed and stated it will raise the bar in terms of the types of businesses to attract. Commissioners Strutzenberg and Hinsley expressed concerns regarding impacts to parking.

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 3-2 (Hinsley and Strutzenberg) vote to recommend that City Council consider adjusting the FAR greater than 0.6 as anything less will not provide sufficient incentives for redevelopment for specific uses and was agreed to.*

Chair Elder discussed PM.7 and PM.8 and suggested the City Council consider expanding pedestrian areas to adjacent lots and consider using imminent domain for redevelopment. Commissioner Ung stated he would not support the suggestion and felt the way that it is written is sufficient.

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 2-3 (Toporow, Strutzenberg and Ung) vote to recommend that City Council consider expanding pedestrian areas to adjacent lots and consider using imminent domain for redevelopment and failed.*

Relative to MO.1, Chair Elder stated one of the most effective incentives is being able to modify parking requirements for specific businesses. In terms of MO.6 and MO.7, Chair Elder discussed support for bicycle lanes down Artesia; felt it is unsafe at this point and prohibitively costly, but suggested putting modifications in place to support it in the future by reducing drive-way cut-throughs now. For MO.13, Chair Elder suggested testing streetlets as close to a final implementation as possible. He suggested encouraging Council to focus using Matthews and Vanderbilt for bike traffic under MO.16.

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 4-1 (Strutzenberg, abstained) vote to recommend that City Council focus on using Matthews and Vanderbilt for bike traffic under MO.16 and was agreed to.*

Commissioner Hinsley presented details of changes he proposed for the AACAP and City Council's consideration. He felt the general direction, overall, is good; discussed the biggest risks since creation of the plan by GPAC as COVID-19 and the impact of Proposition 15; spoke about areas of agreement and areas with which he does not agree and suggested eliminating on-street parking in the blocks at nodes first, on Artesia.

Commissioner Toporow stated it would work if parking structures are built.

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 3-2 (Toporow and Ung) vote to recommend that City Council eliminate on-street parking in the blocks at nodes first, on Artesia and was agreed to.*

Commissioner Hinsley spoke in support of establishing shared parking and then reducing parking requirements to encourage development.

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 3-2 (Toporow and Ung) vote to recommend that City Council eliminate on-street parking in the blocks at nodes first, on Artesia and was agreed to.*

Commissioner Hinsley discussed preferred uses and agreed with identifying preferable uses such as restaurants, retail and office uses on Artesia and office and retail on Aviation. Commissioner Ung spoke in support of encouraging restaurant uses on Aviation. Commissioner Toporow suggested using recommended uses rather than preferred uses.

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 1-4 (Elder, Toporow, Strutzenberg and Ung) vote to recommend to City Council the identification of preferable uses on Artesia such as restaurants, retail and office uses on Artesia and only office and retail uses on Aviation and*

*failed.*

Commissioner Hinsley disagreed with sidewalk/parking lot dining on Artesia and suggested allowing roof-top dining along Artesia. Commissioner Strutzenberg expressed concerns with potential challenges to roof-top dining.

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 5-0 vote to recommend to City Council to add roof-top dining to sidewalk dining on Artesia and was agreed to.*

Commissioner Hinsley noted streetlets are planned for two signalized lights and suggested identifying other locations for streetlets that are not signalized.

Planning Manager Scully noted that multiple locations will be evaluated for streetlets than the two identified in the plan.

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 3-2 (Elder and Toporow) vote to recommend that City Council avoid identified streetlet locations at signalized lights and find other streetlet locations near nodes and was agreed to.*

Commissioner Hinsley suggested that for sellable properties, City Council consider implementing a fee for property owners who choose to leave their sites empty or blighted to motivate and encourage development. Commissioner Toporow reported the Public Art Commission tried to get vacant storefronts on PCH to have artwork in the windows but there were challenges with property owners and added she believes the Public Art Commission would support it doing the same along Artesia. She agreed to implementing a fee or allow property owners of vacant storefronts to place artwork in their windows. Commissioner Strutzenberg questioned the legality of doing that and stated that as a property owner, he would not want it imposed on him. Chair Elder agreed with the idea, but noted he shares Commissioner Strutzenberg's concerns.

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 3-2 (Elder and Strutzenberg) vote to recommend that City Council consider implementing a fee for property owners who choose to leave their sites empty or blighted to motivate and encourage development and was agreed to.*

Commissioner Hinsley highlighted the importance of funding and starting implementation of the AACAP as soon as possible.

Commissioner Strutzenberg reviewed his proposed changes; believed this matter to be receive and file rather than an approval; noted the purpose of the document to allow staff to move forward with proposed zoning changes; opined the document is now outdated; spoke about Artesia remaining a traffic thoroughfare; disagreed with comparisons to Riviera Village; stressed the documents needs to evolve, organically; spoke in support of initiating a Business Improvement District (BID); discussed the proliferation of certain businesses such as massage parlors; suggested the document provides a scattering of concepts that may or may not be relevant and reiterated his recommendation to receive and file it.

Commissioner Toporow expressed concerns regarding project costs; noted challenges in prioritizing one item over the other; discussed the need for defining timeframes; spoke about the document needing a rough projected timeline with potential milestones. Commissioner Ung spoke about the need for funding prior to developing a timeline and discussed uncertainties. Commissioner Strutzenberg suggested recommending a prioritization rather than a timeline.

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 5-0 vote to recommend to City Council to add a prioritization of implementation items, in time, to the AACAP and a standard, linear timeline with milestones to get a feel of the possible roll out and was agreed to.*

Commissioner Toporow discussed funding and suggested the document provide potential funding with a list of potential funding sources. Commissioner Strutzenberg did not believe it would be meaningful because of the scale of the plan.

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 4-1 (Strutzenberg) vote to recommend to City Council to include a pie chart or other visual aids showing the projected possible amounts from different funding sources which would allow some approximation of what is possible and was agreed to.*

Commissioner Ung reviewed his proposed changes to the AACAP; discussed lack of representation on Aviation; wondered what type of improvements would benefit Aviation versus Artesia; spoke about the possibility of forming a BID and addressed the lack of concepts for Aviation. Chair Elder agreed with the concept and noted Aviation has more challenges than Artesia. Commissioner Ung suggested that any references to or desired changes by GPAC should not be included in the plan in terms of mixed uses on Artesia.

Community Development Director Forbes reported the GPAC voted on the issue as well as land uses and moving the plan forward.

Commissioner Ung presented his observations and additional comments; suggested consideration of impacts to surrounding neighborhoods; spoke about the plan's relevance, considering the COVID-19 pandemic and cautioned against smaller businesses being priced out by larger corporations.

Community Development Director Forbes offered the following language: "Potential AACAP changes may result from the pandemic. Make sure this plan has flexibility to adapt to external influences".

Discussion followed regarding incentivizing small businesses to come into the area.

Community Development Director Forbes recommended the following addition to the report: "Consider regulations that encourage local businesses in favor of larger chains."

*A poll of the Commission resulted in a 4-1 (Strutzenberg abstained) vote to recommend to City Council to add the following to the report: "Potential AACAP changes may result from the*

*pandemic. Make sure this plan has flexibility to adapt to a post-pandemic environment” and “Consider regulations that encourage local businesses in favor of larger, national chains” was agreed to.*

Planning Analyst Portolese reported there are members of the public in the meeting wishing to address the Commission and read an e-Comment from Robert Black in support of the AACAP.

Community Development Director Forbes summarized the Planning Commission's comments and recommendations to City Council, as discussed.

Motion by Commissioner Toporow, seconded by Commissioner Ung, to close the Public Hearing. Motion carried unanimously (5-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

Commissioner Hinsley discussed adopting the resolution with the recommendations as listed in Exhibit A; referenced Section 1, Finding B and stated there was nothing in the document detailing consistency with the General Plan. Planning Manager Scully noted no policies were stated specifically in substantiating consistency with the General Plan but in general, the AACAP is consistent with the General Plan. Planning Manager Scully suggested adding language to Finding B as follows: “The proposed Draft AACAP is consistent with the General Plan in that it shall be the goal of the City of Redondo Beach to provide lands for and encourage the development of retail, specialty, entertainment and similar uses which attract customers from adjacent cities in the region as well as serving City residents”, and the Commission concurred.

Motion Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Commissioner Toporow to adopt the attached Resolution, by title only, and “Exhibit A” recommending that the City Council consider the Draft AACAP with any proposed changes to Finding 1.B and comments, changes, or edits to be noted in “Exhibit A”. Motion carried (4-1), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Strutzenberg, opposed and Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

**K. ITEMS CONTINUED FROM PREVIOUS AGENDAS - None**

**L. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION PRIOR TO ACTION**

- L.1. DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION REGARDING AMENDMENTS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION BYLAWS TO CHANGE THE MEETING START TIME**  
**ADOPT A RESOLUTION BY 2/3 VOTE APPROVING THE AMENDMENTS TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION BYLAWS TO CHANGE THE MEETING START TIME TO 6:30 P.M.**

**CONTACT: BRANDY FORBES, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR**

The Commission discussed the possibility of changing the Commission regular meeting times to 6:30 p.m.



Discussion followed regarding other commissions meeting at 6:30 p.m.,

Motion Commissioner Hinsley, seconded by Chair Elder to adopt a resolution, by title only, by a 2/3 vote approving the amendments to the Planning Commission Bylaws to change the meeting start time to 6:30 p.m. Motion failed 3-2 with Commissioners Ung and Toporow, opposed and Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

Discussion followed regarding the possibility of reconsidering the item when a full Commission is present.

**M. ITEMS FROM STAFF - None**

**N. COMMISSION ITEMS AND REFERRALS TO STAFF - None**

**O. ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, Commissioner Hinsley motioned, seconded by Commissioner Ung, to adjourn at 12:05 a.m. September 18, 2020, to the next Planning Commission meeting on Thursday, October 15, 2020, at 7:00 p.m. Motion carried unanimously (5-0), by roll call vote, with Commissioner Rodriguez, absent.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Brandy Forbes  
Community Development Director